

## Right to the city and hospitable school: possibilities to develop educating cities<sup>1</sup>

*Direito à cidade e escola hospitaleira: possibilidades para desenvolver cidades educadoras*

*Derecho a la ciudad y escuela hospitalaria: posibilidades para el desarrollo de ciudades educadoras*

Alceli Ribeiro Alves<sup>I</sup>

Adriane da Silva Schmidt<sup>II</sup>

### ABSTRACT

Based on the perspective of the urban agenda of educating cities, this article aims to examine the challenges, possibilities and needs of the contemporary school, observing the changes in society and the ways that allow subjects to relate to different spaces of learning and training, beyond the walls of the school. The article is supported by social, pedagogical, and geographical theories. Based on bibliographic and documental research, it is possible to identify the need for the school not only to open up, but also to go out into the world, be hospitable and have its philosophy aligned with good educational and municipal management practices. Finally, it is argued that a look at the right to the city, especially the use and occupation of public and private spaces, can become an effective instrument in the construction and exercise of the right to the educating city.

**Keywords:** Educating City. Hospitable School. City. Management.


### RESUMO

Com base na perspectiva da agenda urbana de cidades educadoras, este artigo tem o objetivo de examinar os desafios, as possibilidades e necessidades da escola contemporânea, observando as mudanças na sociedade e os caminhos que possibilitam aos sujeitos relacionarem-se com espaços diversos de aprendizagem e formação, para além dos muros da escola. O artigo encontra guarida em teorias sociais, pedagógicas e geográficas. Com base na pesquisa bibliográfica e documental, constata-se a necessidade de a escola não apenas se abrir, mas também de ir para o mundo, ser hospitaleira e ter sua filosofia alinhada com as boas práticas de gestão educacional e municipal. Ao fim, argumenta-se que um olhar para o direito à cidade, especialmente para o uso e a ocupação dos espaços públicos e privados, pode se tornar efetivo instrumento na construção e no exercício do direito à cidade educadora.

**Palavras-chave:** Cidade Educadora. Escola Hospitaleira. Cidade. Gestão.

<sup>1</sup> O presente artigo é fruto das pesquisas realizadas no projeto “A Cidade como Currículo e a Cidade como Negócio”, conduzido no âmbito do Grupo de Pesquisa EDUCIDADE (A Educação e a Cidade), junto ao Programa de Pós-Graduação Mestrado e Doutorado Profissional em Educação e Novas Tecnologias, do Centro Universitário Internacional UNINTER.

<sup>I</sup>Centro Universitário Internacional, Curitiba, PR, Brazil. Email: [alceli.ribeiro@gmail.com](mailto:alceli.ribeiro@gmail.com)  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2256-2915>

<sup>II</sup>Centro Universitário Internacional, Curitiba, PR, Brazil. Email: [adrischmidt870@gmail.com](mailto:adrischmidt870@gmail.com)  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3103-1849>

## RESUMEN

A partir de la perspectiva de la agenda urbana de Ciudades Educadoras, este artículo tiene el objetivo de examinar los retos, posibilidades y necesidades de la escuela contemporánea, observando los cambios en la sociedad y los caminos que permiten a los sujetos relacionarse con espacios diversos de aprendizaje y formación, más allá de los muros de la escuela. El artículo encuentra apoyo en teorías sociales, pedagógicas y geográficas. Sobre la base de investigación bibliográfica y documental, se constata la necesidad de que la escuela no solo se abra, sino que también se dirija hacia el mundo, que sea hospitalaria y tenga su filosofía alineada con las buenas prácticas de gestión educacional y municipal. Finalmente, se argumenta que una mirada hacia el Derecho a la Ciudad, en especial hacia el uso y ocupación de los espacios públicos y privados, puede volverse un efectivo instrumento en la construcción y ejercicio del Derecho a la Ciudad Educadora.

**Palabras clave:** Ciudad Educadora. Escuela Hospitalaria. Ciudad. Gestión.

## INTRODUCTION

This paper aims to analyze the perspective of an educating city from two broad analytical branches: educational management and urban management for the development of educating cities. In the field of urban management, this approach focuses on issues related to knowledge of the territory and private and public spaces, from the perspective of the right to the city and inspired by the Charter of Educating Cities (AICE, 2020).

Regarding educational management, we dedicate this research to the role of the school and to the initial and continuous training process of educational professionals. Observing the role of the contemporary school from a critical point of view, our analysis has sought to dialogue with the work of many authors, trying to reflect on pedagogical practices and highlighting the need to rethink the role of educational institutions, teachers, administrators and assistants, among others, as fundamental for the construction of welcoming relationships due to the great diversity of students that enter our schools today.

Researchers need to rethink schools and their practices, understanding the changes we are all experiencing due to the progress of modernity, the development of information and communication technologies (ICT), and the growing importance of informal and non-formal educational spaces for the integral education of our children and young people.

The urgency of thinking about the development of learning from a holistic, multiscale, and multidimensional perspective, understanding subjects as holders of rights and subjectivities, in a world that is constantly changing, is upon us at every moment. Faced with this new moment in the evolution of our society, we are broadening the reflection on education, its objectives, and the different ways of conducting pedagogical work.

By learning new perspectives on community life and its meanings, we want to understand the relationships that are created with the city from its educational territories and the possible actions to promote people's happiness. In this regard, we appeal to researchers such as Makiguti (1994), Lefebvre (2001), Arroyo (2013a; 2013b), Bellot (2013), Moll (2013), Bonafé (2014), Baptista (2016), and Carbonell (2016) to reflect on and understand what they claim about this topic.

Our intention, related to the approach that studies urban management, is to consider the different hierarchical levels, from the city hall to the education department, which, at best, includes the directors and supervisors of educational institutions and the community in general.

Keep in mind that urban and educational management do not address tasks or approaches that are essentially different from each other when it comes to education, particularly the development of an educating city. There are important points of intersection between these two great fields, and joint efforts that need to be planned and managed, where the teams can come together and work so that the school and the city can develop, using a systemic view of society.

In the same way that the city government must look at education and the school, the school must also look at the city to know how to make better use of it, incorporating it into its reality, its educational context, and its practice. The inclusion of the city in the curriculum and practice of schools opens new perspectives for integral education, allowing an identification with the territory, a sense of belonging and the development of an educating city.

So, the big questions that emerge are: how to do this? How to create intersections that involve schools and the city, allowing students and teachers to own the city, to use it in their “meaningful” learning and social practice, while creating and developing ties with the territory?

For this reason, we look at the production of urban space as a possibility, with a strong basis in social and geographical theories, especially in relation to discussions about the right to the city. In this theoretical and methodological approach, this study has analyzed the work of authors such as Harvey (1973), Lefebvre (2001), Santos (2007) and Carlos (2021), looking for insights to develop our own method and intending to understand the links between school and city.

So, this paper has a double objective. On the one hand, it analyzes the schools and understands them from the perspective of the role they must play in the construction of the educating city and of the social practices of its professionals. Our approach here includes the idea that an educating city must contribute to making schools a space of hospitality and welcome, with a humanitarian perspective on the construction of an ethical and solidary society.

The school must also promote meaningful and useful experiences for students by integrating the school and the city. In other words, an education that has the city as its curriculum, and that goes beyond the walls of the school. This approach establishes a discussion about a welcoming school, integrating it into the theoretical, conceptual, and methodological foundations of educating cities, from the perspective of a humanized school and administration.

Given these considerations, this approach entails a reflection on the training processes, whether initial or continuing, of the professionals dedicated to education. It is our conviction that these two perspectives converge towards a holistic, integrative, and humanized training approach that encompasses the various educational spaces.

On the other hand, the aim is to understand if and how an analysis of the production of urban space can shed light on fundamental and important issues arising from these debates on the right to the city. The study of social and geographical theories has strongly influenced this paper, both of which are fundamental for understanding the functioning and transformation of our contemporary cities and societies.

With that in mind, under a methodological point of view, we can define this research as basic regarding its nature, since it is a theoretical or experimental study “that seeks to contribute in an original or incremental way to the understanding of the observable facts and phenomena” (Casarin and Casarin, 2012, p. 30). Regarding the modality, this is mostly qualitative work, based on bibliographical and documentary research, “that develops itself [...] using the knowledge available from the theories that are published in books or related works” (Köche, 2015, p. 122).

## THE HOSPITABLE SCHOOL

Before discussing the concept of a hospitable school, it is necessary to define what is meant by “hospitality” in this research. According to the Oxford Languages dictionary, the word refers to “the

quality of that which is hospitable” or also “a good welcome” (Hospitalidade, 2022). Considering that this is a very important moment in the life of subjects and especially of children and adolescents, hospitality in schools is not only important because this is their first contact with others, with a world beyond their homes and families: hospitality in schools is also a manifestation of the feelings, empathy and otherness of children and adolescents in relation to the others and, in turn, of the others in relation to them. As we know, this process marks the lives of the subjects in a positive or negative way, and the feelings — of empathy, otherness etc. — are inevitably recorded in this first moment of welcome.

For Derrida, hospitality refers to “what one gives to others before they identify themselves, before they become (placed or assumed to be) a subject, a subject of rights, or a subject called by its surname etc.” (2003, p. 23). The word “hospitality” in this context means to admit that “the guest gives himself unconditionally to the host and vice versa. The host becomes the guest, and the guest becomes the host, without losing their identity” (Derrida, 2003, p. 27).

According to Mantoan (2021), the notion of a school of all and for all is the definition of a hospitable school, because hospitality is something unconditional. In developing this argument, Mantoan (2021) mentions the example of a child who has just arrived at a new school, and is full of doubts, emotions, and worries. For the author, this is a moment that requires a lot of caution by all the actors involved, since the reception of a child in school is something that goes beyond any identification, which means that before the right of the child to be in school, there is reception, hospitality.

From this perspective, the hospitable school is not interested in categorized stable identities that exclude or divide. The school should be focused on welcoming in such a way that it would never first ask whether the child or young person has a learning disability, such as Down syndrome or autism spectrum disorder.

In this case, Mantoan (2021) advocates the duty to adopt hospitality as a principle because our identities are movable — one moment we are one thing and the next moment we are something else: fathers, mothers, sons, brothers etc. This means that, primarily, the hospitable school ignores the invented categories that place people in a fixed identity related to one or another chosen attribute (Mantoan, 2021).

The hospitable school is interested in learning as a relational and participatory experience that has meaning for the student because it encompasses his or her subjectivity, built through collectivity (Mantoan, 2008). According to Arroyo (2013a), this implies the salvation of a stolen humanity and implies that teachers should reveal themselves as human beings just like the students.

According to this renowned Spanish sociologist and educator, “our work is to reveal the laws of nature, the production of space, of life, to teach school subjects [...] but above all to reveal ourselves to the new generations, to reveal humanity, culture and the meanings that we learn and that are learned in the history of cultural development” (Arroyo, 2013a, p. 66).

According to Tiriba (2010), it is necessary to break down the walls of schools and allow children to have more contact with nature, which is the manifestation of the life that is present in all beings that surround them. According to her, “it is necessary to reinvent the times, spaces and routines of preschool institutions to allow children to have access to the life that surrounds them, in other words, to maintain and nourish the links that confirm their existence as organic beings” (Tiriba, 2010, p. 7).

This study shares Leonardo Boff’s view that people should seek the “right measure” by feeling like nature: “the more you immerse yourself in it, the more you feel when to change and when to preserve something in your life or in your relationships” (Boff, 2007, p. 116).

Thinking about the school and its integration into the environment implies rethinking the nature that is present in its surroundings, especially when this nature has already moved away from what is natural and has moved closer to the world of forms and work materialized by society.

This means that the school must be a place of connection and inclusion, a place for everyone, so that what is experienced through the initiatives and actions of the school is not far from what the students experience in their communities and daily lives. For this reason, we agree with Mosé when he states that “studying is more and more about understanding where we live, what relationships prevail there, what kind of life is imposed on us, to know up to what point we want to follow the existing ways or invent our own” (2015, p. 83).

For the school to become a rich place of hospitality, it is our duty to ask about the pedagogical practices that will be developed there. In this regard, it is important to mention here what Isabel Baptista argues:

a hospitable welcome is the condition for a happy and successful learning experience. However, we must remember that the experience of hospitality goes beyond the moment of reception, since it implies a responsible and careful commitment to what is received. This, in a school context, it forces us to understand the institutional behaviors and the quality of educational practices that are necessary to implement hospitality. In other words, it is about the realization of an ethical imperative that goes beyond guaranteeing the comfort, well-being, and satisfaction of the guest.

For this purpose, it is necessary to take a careful look that will allow us to understand the inherent needs of the subjects in their specificity. When we talk about hospitality, it is not just about buildings or planned and organized spaces that are ready for everyone who is welcomed in the school space. Hospitality does not refer to detailed strategies for the implementation of pedagogical work developed in the formal space of the school. Without a doubt, these are the necessary conditions for hospitality, but they do not represent the totality of what needs to be considered.

This is also the opinion of Arroyo (2013a, p. 64):

we can have schools in good conditions, well-equipped, with good salaries and reasonable working conditions, but the human atmosphere can be missing. This is because the relationships between the teachers or with the management and among the students can be distant, formal, cold, bureaucratic, or objectified. In these material and working conditions, the students will be able to learn and will be approved, but they won't learn one of the main subjects, how to be human. Neither will the most experienced teachers be able to teach, nor will the beginner students, who are getting started in the arts of life, learn what it means to be a human being.

In this regard, Azevedo (2011 *apud* Baptista, 2016, p. 210) explains that the school, the family, and social education in general have a central role in contemporary society because of the possibility and opportunity they offer to promote the personalized human development of each and every one throughout life and with life.

In fact, they strengthen relationships when we understand the need to integrate the school into the community and the city, and the importance of the local and everyday contexts in which subjects experience other spaces beyond the walls of the school.

## THE SCHOOL AS AN INTEGRAL PART OF THE COMMUNITY

The school occupies a privileged and fundamental place in every society, from the earliest age, fulfilling its vital role in the integral formation of subjects and being the place where we constantly rethink and revise initial and continuing education, considering the practice of the professionals who work in it. However, we also understand that we must integrate the school into its environment, to engage with its community, contributing to dialogue and to the necessary changes.

Therefore, it is important to offer the subjects of learning different opportunities to relate to the many spaces of learning and training beyond the walls of the school. Here we emphasize that the formal, informal, and non-formal spaces are complementary and must be widely used for the integral formation of people.

In a didactic and objective way, the analysis of Bacila (2021) makes a distinction that is very clarifying between these three spaces of formation. For this esteemed teacher and researcher,

formal education is developed in the school environment, in the classroom, with a structured curriculum. Non-formal education takes place outside the school, in museums, public spaces, neighborhoods and streets, while informal education occurs without intention, in the process of socialization, in religious groups, media and family exchanges. (Bacila, 2021, p. 1042)

Obviously, the school never loses its importance when it goes out into the world and uses it — on the contrary, the school now has many more options or “strategies to adopt in the process of teaching and learning” (Alves and Brandenburg, 2018, p. 36-37). However, schools need to know that we construct knowledge in practice, in society and in the city. For example, in understanding the factors that contribute to the construction and transformation of different landscapes, in localizing certain activities in certain places, and in understanding how and why the city grows in some regions, among others

From this perspective, this study analyzes the interview with Gadotti published by Mosé (2015). Gadotti explains that, for the school to have life and play its role in the teaching of subjects, it must interact with the environment; “not only open itself to the world, but go out to the world” (Mosé, 2015, p. 136).

It is through its insertion into the world that the school transforms itself and becomes capable of transformation, allowing itself, in these rich experiences, to be humanized and its actors to be sensitized. Gadotti mentions a teacher who had reported to him the experience of leaving the school and understanding the reality of one of his students in a violent region of the city of Sao Paulo. The teacher had said: “I’ve been teaching in this school for 17 years, and I’m going to radically change my way of teaching and learning because I’ve finally gotten to know where the student lives, and I’ve finally met my student” (Mosé, 2015, p. 136).

From the same perspective as Gadotti, the teacher’s actions, which we can understand as erroneous and decontextualized from their environment, represent how the process of artificializing students takes place. Gadotti explains:

Why? The student has been artificialized, put in front of the classroom, and we have forgotten that this student has a life story, parents, a mother, grandparents, a house, likes music, dances, walks the streets, likes to climb trees, likes to hug, and feel. The student is all of that. If we narrow the focus too much, we cannot see the whole picture. We see a tree, but we forget that this tree is in the middle of a forest. (Mosé, 2015, p. 136-137)

In the lesson presented by Makiguti (1994), we can see the importance, for the creation of human values, of interaction and of the educational possibilities contained in the relations that exist within community life, which begin to internalize ideals that are costly for a collaborative life in society, within a cohabitation ethics related to the construction of a subject's personal happiness.

In the works of Voss (2013), another important pedagogical idea defended by Makiguti is highlighted, which focuses on the value system, like "good, benefits and beauty" — a useful reference to those that want to reflect about the teaching of children and young people beyond the walls of the school, counting on the community's participation. For Makiguti, cited by Voss (2013, p. 67),

the community is the great teacher of life because it contains the immediate reality — the here and now — built communally, that is, by consensus. The specific agreements within the available resources make the different ways of organizing life possible in specificities and specific cultures. The result is the internalization of an ethic of coexistence, consolidated by the bonds of solidarity constructed and established in the community. "Good", as a product of the ethic of solidarity, is fundamental to the creation of human values.

Considering that education aims at the happiness of subjects in society, in community life, Makiguti puts forward relevant reflections when considering education in a social context, seeking a constructed happiness in society, and in this context the author tells us that:

for education to achieve its goal of happiness and fulfillment for all, it must transform the social existence of apathy, alienation, and egocentrism into a lucid compromise with society. Education can and must lead the subject to recognize his commitment to society and the state in which he lives, not only in terms of satisfying his basic needs and security but in terms of everything that constitutes happiness. (Makiguti, 1994, p. 45)

Participation in social life is part of human nature, and we all have conditions to contribute. Boff shares this view (2007, p. 35) in the following terms: "Man is a participatory being, a social agent, a personal and collective historical subject for the construction of the most egalitarian, just, free and fraternal social relations possible within the given historical and social conditions".

From the perspective of an educating city, such participation in social life contributes to the process of generating the subject's identification with its environment, be it a city, a neighborhood, or a community. Principle number 10 of the Charter of Educating Cities (AICE, 2020, p. 13-14) affirms that identity "is the basis for a fruitful dialogue with the surroundings and with the world, [...] while fostering among its inhabitants the feeling of belonging and shared responsibility".

Hence the importance of community and of active participation in social life for the integral formation of individuals, far beyond the spaces of formal education. The educating city emerges from this broader perspective of educational spaces, encompassing social, economic, environmental, and other relationships that include neighbors, family, community, and, on a larger scale, the city, the country, and the global space.

## REFRAMING THE SCHOOL ON AN EDUCATING CITY

By establishing a dialogue with the community, we open the doors of the school to a fresh look at the city and all that it offers around us. In this way, from discussions about the major international urban agendas and the need to reinvent the school emerges a new perspective which includes the intersection between education and the city, the educating city.

With this bold and innovative approach, in 1989 the Barcelona City Council welcomed and adopted the concept of the Educating City, introducing it at the same time as the meaning of an integrative proposal for formal, non-formal and informal education that is born in the context of the city and is for everyone who inhabits it; it also reveals a political, public and active compromise that involves not only the family and the school, but also the municipality, the associations, the cultural industries, the companies and all the other institutions and collectives. (Bellot, 2013, p. 19)

In the educating city, “education transcends the school walls to permeate the entire city. This leads to a citizen-focused education, where all administrations assume their responsibility to educate and transform the city into a space of respect for life and diversity” (AICE, 2020, p. 4).

In this context, we adopt the perspective of Alves and Castanheira (2021, p. 1001) when they argue that “the educating city is not only a pedagogical proposal, but also a policy capable of transforming neighborhoods, schools and entire communities”. However, as the authors affirm, “although it’s a proposal that leads to meaningful learning, it shouldn’t have as its only objective to understand the city by observing the interaction between society and the environment” (Alves and Castanheira, 2021, p. 1001).

Along the same lines, we also agree with Moll (2013) when she addresses the need to think about new possibilities for school, community, and city life:

The concepts of an educating city or of the city as pedagogy can broaden our understanding of education and allow us to reinvent the school as it seeks to reinvent the city and, within it, the community as places of cohabitation, dialogue, and continuous learning, from the perspective of strengthening democracy and affirming freedoms. (Moll, 2013, p. 221-222)

Bonafé (2014) shares the same understanding. In an interview for Portal Aprendiz, the author claims that there is a curriculum in the streets that must be studied and accessed by the students for them to possess the wisdom that comes from a wide scope of knowledge that is available in these spaces. With this understanding, the author suggests:

Let’s understand what the big avenues, the commercial centers and the plazas mean; what they mean to the children or to the old people, to the men or to the women, to the blacks or to the whites. Let us see what meanings are constructed in the city and realize that in one city there are many cities, interpreted as the world of each one. I propose that we explore the idea of the city constructing the curriculum. (Bonafé, 2014)

Bonafé is a great advocate of the idea of overcoming the notion of a school that is only articulated with its environment. For him, it is necessary to go beyond this articulation and adopt the city as a curriculum because “the street is a class, a blackboard, a place to write” (Bonafé, 2014). In a lecture at the first Seminário Internacional de Educação Integral [International Seminar on Integral Education], organized by the group Territórios, Educação Integral e Cidadania [Territories, Integral Education and Citizenship] (TEIA), Bonafé mentions that his work proposal has as its starting point the city as curriculum.

This prestigious researcher claims there is a strong need to analyze the city “as a creator of practices, experiences, relations and materialities that articulate a way of understanding the culture and of understanding itself as part of it” (Bonafé, 2014). The previously mentioned author also teaches us that:



We cannot think about the city without thinking about the subjects who inhabit it — the subjects who interpret it, who live it, or who live it badly. The city is a material form of culture, a complex cultural device from which messages and meanings emerge, where we construct and destroy experiences, where stories and narratives feed, and where we form and transform biographies. (Bonafé, 2010)

But the work of Bonafé is not only important for raising these questions related to the curriculum. It provokes us to try to mobilize people so that the educating city can emerge and develop with the participation of other agents, not only schools or educational institutions. Here we relate Bonafé's work to the objectives of this study and, in a broader sense, to the research intentions that inspire and move us as a research group.

When we consider the participation of many agents in the construction of the city as a curriculum and the proposal of an educating city as a political and pedagogical proposal, we are referring to the educational and municipal administration. It is important to note that even Bonafé (2014) has the same perspective when he argues that "it is necessary to intervene in this text of the city from a different pedagogy — it's a task not only for the educator, but also for the mayors and the people who have responsibilities in the municipal administration".

At the same time, we understand that this requires, in a sense, looking at the city through children's eyes, as in Tonucci's (1997) perspective. This means that, from one side, there is a view directed towards education and municipal administration, and from the other side there is a view directed towards the school, its environment, and the city as curriculum.

By giving children and young people a leading role in their own learning, through observation, comparison, knowledge and previous experience, the landscape reveals a magic that can transform the minds and lives of our children and young people. The city attracts the interest of the observer and increases the desire to learn through the study of its surroundings, movements, and transformations. Despite the significant subjective content of this approach, it undoubtedly presents itself as a proposal with immense potential for generating identity, a sense of belonging, education for democracy (Mesquita, 2022) and the exercise of citizenship (Westheimer, 2004; 2015).

As perceived in the relevant work of Mosé (2014), it is necessary to value the experiences that take place outside the school space and to include them in the curriculum. For this author, "it is necessary to value the content that students already have, to know what they bring, and to recognize that the important things we learn in life are not necessarily learned in school" (Mosé, 2014, p. 56).

Resignifying the school means understanding the need to broaden the vision and allow the opening of new spaces to explore what the educating cities movement has often defined as "educational territories". This means resignifying and allowing a broad reading of the city, its surroundings, the journey of knowledge construction and the sense of belonging that leads us to the idea of identity, territory and territoriality coming from the triad of subjects, school, and city (space).

Jaume Carbonell (2016, p. 15) has the same point of view when he mentions that:

In short, the city is an open book, a kind of Wikipedia, which all subjects can freely contribute with, access, relate, contextualize, re-elaborate, share, systematize, summarize, and question, considering a vast and uncountable wealth of knowledge.

When we open the doors of the school to get to know the city, we also open ways to explore and many adventures to discover. To appreciate, to explore, to discover, to enchant oneself. The training of teachers is especially important in this context, based on a look at the city and practicing, for example, the perceptions about the relations between society and nature, the spaces of memory

and the importance of material and immaterial heritage. And, in association with the latter, valuing heritage education (Torres *et al.*, 2021).

Alternatively, we may take into account not only the cities that are located in the heart of the metropolitan region of large capital cities, but also those that have territorial and border dynamics, with an analysis of the role of educational institutions in the transformation of urban and regional space, such as the analysis of Oderich and Baldi (2020) and Silva-Garbossa (2019).

## LIMITS AND CRITICISM IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE EDUCATING CITY

Regarding the limits and criticisms of the educating city as a proposal for the construction of public policies for education, it is possible to distinguish at least two distinct positions. On one hand, according to the arguments of Moraes (2009), it is possible to understand the educating city perspective as a “force-idea”, representing a step towards the horizontalization of relations between the State and civil society or the socialization of the State. On the other, the educating city as a proposal and a broad perception of the curriculum dilutes the specificity of formal education and allows the gradual withdrawal of the State from its role as guarantor of the social right to education and responsible for its realization (Hidalgo, 2008).

The horizontalization of relations between the state and civil society and its consequences for education are questionable, but it’s impossible to deny that this phenomenon involves a greater number of actors capable of transforming the education and lives of children and young people, especially those who live in communities that are poor in many services, especially public ones.

It is in this sense that Moraes (2009, p. 168) says that, more than a precise category, the educating city represents a “force-idea, ... a motto, a calling, a suggestive slogan that provides an image very adequate to the complexity of the educational work”. In our understanding, it is not only about educational work, but also about the democratization of schools and educating cities.

From this perspective, researchers can glimpse alternative forms of participation in city governance, like participatory and deliberative democracy, where democracy does not necessarily result from the outcome of the deliberation itself, but from discussion, debate, counterpoint, reflection on ideas and different interests.

In this way, we are confronted with non-hegemonic proposals for participation. It is important to remember that hegemonic proposals are linked to representation through the participation and action of political parties. However, based on the alternative ways of participation we continue to seek better control of the state by society, in such a way that it is possible to argue in favor of a socialization of the state.

In this perspective, transformations do not necessarily come from bureaucratic and vertical strategies, but rather from the leading role given to the agents themselves. It is precisely here that the projects promoted by institutes, companies, and civil society associations, among others, are strengthened and established in the communities, transforming the lives of the people who inhabit them and (re)producing their daily lives.

The opinion of Mészáros also helps to defend this idea of power. According to him (2005, p. 53), “a large part of our learning continuum is, fortunately, outside the formal educational institutions”. In his understanding, however, the greater insertion of informal education in the training of subjects must happen based on a prioritization of public education, associated with a popular organization maintained by the state.

In this sense, Moll *et al.* (2021, p. 49) acknowledge that:

From the assumptions of an Educating City, it is possible to construct socially sustainable societies on the condition that governments, organizations and subjects

are open to dialogue, ... with the aim of overcoming the institutional limits imposed on the understanding of education in modernity, while at the same time creating a broad base that challenges us to think intergenerationally, intersectorally and interdisciplinarily about human cohabitation.

Despite the optimism that the proposal can generate, it is important to mention that this is not a public policy with guaranteed success. This is a reality that shows itself in the challenges that the federated states must overcome in terms of educational administration, including issues of concurrent competences, as well as in the implementation and execution of the public policy itself, which inevitably passes through each public policy at different levels of commitment and follow-up.

For these and other reasons and limitations, criticism is emerging around the consolidation of the right to an educating city, in such a way that, for some researchers, the educating city project has not borne fruit in practice and, apart from exceptional cases that are very localized, could be understood as a utopia (Carbonell, 2000).

Again, we can refer to the issue of the democratic governance of the city, as recommended by the Estatuto da Cidade [City Statute], Federal Law No. 10.257, of 2001. One of the criticisms relates to the complexity involved in the process of effectively increasing popular participation, both in school management and in urban planning.

According to Carneiro *et al.*, “it is not a very easy task to get governments and communities accustomed to this participation, ... it all depends on the effort and the interest of the administration to educate them for this purpose” (2018, p. 6). In this way, it is a related proposition that seeks to minimize this limitation for the administrative councils, which are the potential agents with the task of mediating between organized civil society and government bodies (Gohn, 2016).

In relation to the second opinion, that of a broader view of a curriculum, the discussion becomes much more complex. This is due to the possibility of participation of many agents that can act in different spaces of formation, opening opportunities for non-governmental agents to be called upon to collaborate in the education of children and young people.

Here, the great limitation for the effective application of a proposal for an educating city collides with the perspective of an ample defense of the liberal deschooling of education, inserted in the context of the minimal state. Ivan Illich represents this tendency in his famous work *Deschooling Society*, of 1971.

While Illich (2018) encourages learning in informal and non-formal spaces of education, intentional social relations, and a fluid education, including that which takes place in the city, he focuses on criticizing the state organization and takes a position that rejects investment in the education system to minimize the problems of education.

The problem with Illich’s analysis of school and formal education is that the author usually ignores the necessities and realities of poor communities that need the state to secure and implement public policies. This is a fundamental issue that cannot be ignored, especially when assessing the state’s capacity, in underdeveloped countries, to ensure quality education for all.

In a more critical approach, this opening refers to the gradual dismantling of state functions. For Hidalgo (2008), for example, the assumptions of educating cities, as made explicit by the United Nations for Education, Science and Culture (Unesco), “dilute the specificity of the role of formal education in society, corroborating the intention of relieve the state of its role as financier of educational policies”.

Another important issue related to the challenges of the implementation of the educating city is the expansion of full-time education and/or extended working hours. Despite this, the work of Moll and Leclerc (2012) makes us reflect on the possibilities to promote the creation, expansion, and effectiveness of social rights and, consequently, to minimize the limitations of public administration capacities.

For these authors, full-time education “is on the field of affirmative action policies, as a priority, not exclusively, for the historically excluded social classes or with limited access to cultural and material goods, due to their concrete conditions of existence” (Moll and Leclerc, 2012, p. 25). In this way, the authors argue that it is necessary to invest in a popular government policy that seeks to “correct the socio-historical injustices” (Moll and Leclerc, 2012, p. 23).

Regarding the performance of public administration, another limitation relates to intersectorality, as already highlighted by Alves and Castanheira (2021). For these authors, the level of commitment, the role of each body or secretariat, as well as the division of activities involving the government sectors are still poorly articulated and publicized.

In this way, projects, initiatives and actions are usually limited to educational institutions, in the relationship between schools/universities and communities, often carried out by private entities and, when seen in the public arena, mostly by state and municipal secretariats, except in rare cases that involve, in a synergetic and integrated way, all the public administration structures.

Another criticism or limitation which is especially important concerns the democratic management of cities, its implementation by the people and the citizens themselves. This is a fundamental assumption, not only in the construction of a public policy for education, but also to ensure the democratic administration of the city, as established by Article 43 of Law No. 10.257, of 2001, known as Estatuto da Cidade.

So, from this perspective, the right to an educating city comes from the right to the city itself. As carefully observed by Harvey (2015), a city for the people needs more protagonism for the people. For this purpose, however, people should not live as spectators of what happens in cities; on the contrary, they need to actively participate in the construction of the city they want to live in. In other words, lack of participation leads to lack of democracy in the city.

Finally, it is necessary to consider the limits of the educating city as a proposal for the construction of public policies for education in the context of the commodification of the city. Once again, Harvey draws attention to the fact that cities have been overwhelmed by capital, and by large corporations in alliance with the state. In this way, they became places of wealth production rather than dignified places to live, where people could rely on the fulfillment of their basic conditions to live with dignity (Harvey, 2015).

In the Brazilian context, a similar analysis is made by Carlos, Volochko and Alvarez (2015), who observe that, in the phenomenon of real estate speculation and the power of financial capital, there is an important discussion about the city as a business, in an understanding of the city as a commodity to be consumed in the market, and not as a space of participation, listening and transformation of itself and in favor of the people, as it should be.

## **THE RIGHT TO THE CITY AS A CONDITION FOR EXERCISING THE RIGHT TO AN EDUCATING CITY**

As we have seen, the possibilities offered by formal education are not limited to the fundamental right to education. The informal and non-formal spaces and, above all, the city, inserted in this last spatial section, can and should be used as very useful tools in the integral education of subjects.

If we understand the city as a privileged space for the integral education of the people, and, also, as a representation of the social relations that contribute to the realization of the right to the city, it is interesting to recall, in this context, the saying of Henri Lefebvre (2001, p. 134), who refers to this subject cleverly and with common sense:

The right to the city manifests itself as a higher form of rights: the right to freedom, the right to individualization in socialization, the right to habitat and to inhabit.

The right to construction (participatory activity) and the right to appropriation (different from the right to ownership) are included in the right to the city.

Our understanding of this issue as regards the right to the city is that Lefebvre attacks an issue that is important for building the city we want for present and future generations: the problem of urban ownership. Although this is related to Principles 6 (knowledge of the environment) and 11 (habitable public space) of the Chart of the Educating City, this issue has not been extensively debated in the discussions promoted in the context of the educating city.

In this sense, much has been discussed with regard to the integral education of the people and the role of the school, but little is known about the city itself, as already pointed out by Alves and Castanheira (2021), when approaching innovative projects and research gaps from the perspective of educating cities.

We recognize, defend, and use this approach to the school and the formal spaces of education as part of the analysis that is necessary to construct and develop the educating city, but we consider it equally important to answer these questions: For whom is the city? How is it produced and transformed? Who directs these transformations? Whether it is the construction of a city, a school, or a building, as analyzed by Bencostta (2016, p. 250), “time and space dialogue with the transformations of the urban tissue and, closely, with the policies and interests that define its constructions”.

Beyond this approach that favors the built space, the architecture, and the use of public spaces, we wonder if the municipalities, through urban zoning, can offer some guidelines in this perspective for schools, universities or even to produce urban spaces in the cities; and what is the role of urban property and housing in the construction of identity and belonging.

Understand that, guided by only two of the principles contained in the Chart of the Educating Cities — 6 and 11, which refer to the city commitment — we have broadened discussions in such a way that we have addressed the important social issues and shed light on many doubts related to the right to an educating city.

For this reason, to approach the right to an educating city, it is necessary to analyze if (and how) the practice of the right to the city takes place, a *sine qua non* condition to move forward in the direction of including informal and non-formal spaces in the discussion and seeking answers to the great questions related to the educating city. The right to the city, in this perspective, is a dive with an inquiring look inside the problems and opportunities that the city presents, and a big jump beyond the walls of the school.

The concept of identity is important in this context because it retrieves a reality that is often forgotten or ignored, that is, that identity “is the feeling of belonging to what is ours” (Santos, 2007, p. 14). It is part of the feeling of belonging, of the connection between man and nature, which establishes a link with the territory. According to Santos (2007, p. 14), “the territory used is land plus identity”.

Urban property goes beyond the idea that considers only the legal power granted by the law for the subjects to use, enjoy, dispose of, and recover a certain property, as the law teaches us. Property is also linked to other factors that construct a more just society and city, because it is linked to the idea of place, the construction of identity, and even survival and dignity.

David Harvey approached this question in 1973, but in a different context. Instead of territory, he spoke in terms of the relationship between the land and the needs of the people who live in them, occupying a given space. His analysis considered the use and exchange value of land, viewing it as a commodity.

The renowned geographer emphasized the inherent need of all human beings to inhabit and live somewhere. He would say, “I cannot exist without occupying space, I cannot work without occupying a place and using the material objects available, and I cannot live without a house of some kind” (Harvey, 1973, p. 135).

Furthermore, the social issue is also important under the banner of the educating cities, and under the principle of the habitable public space, Harvey (1973) reminds us that “living somewhere” is not an anachronism in the context of today’s problems of land ownership or property.

In rethinking the issue of land and habitable public spaces, it is urgent to also rethink the right to the educating city from the broader perspective of the right to the city, the right to a home, or, in other words, to private habitable spaces. If freedom, the right to life, equality, security etc., are fundamental rights written in our Constitution, how can this study avoid approaching this issue from the perspective of another fundamental right, the right to property?

In other words, to discuss housing, urban life, real estate, urban planning, urban policies etc. is an urgent task in this discussion — a task that represents a large gap in the issue of the right to the educating cities.

We cannot forget that the ownership, right, and occupation of the land have a direct relation with the production of the urban space and urban management. In the same way, from the perspective of educational administration, there is a strong intersection with the initiatives that stimulate the feeling of belonging to the space in which we live, or even with the generation of identity with this space.

It is no coincidence that, in many educating cities, the issue of housing emerges as a major challenge and problem for local public administrations. It suffices to make a field analysis of the problems we find in cities like São Paulo and Curitiba, among other Brazilian capitals that are part of the Chart of the Educating Cities.

The issue of housing attracts our attention precisely because it is a fundamental condition for the exercise of the right to an educating city. After all, how can a child or a young person have expectations, dreams and plenty of will if his or her right to education is limited by living conditions that are often inhumane, uncomfortable, lacking basic sanitation, family cohabitation and social experience? Many of these children and youth are living in substandard housing, so not only are they included in the statistics, but their realities, problems and challenges cannot be ignored.

Many of these activities are conducted by women, low-income adults and, of course, children and adolescents, many of whom are in a vulnerable situation, exposed to all kinds of risks. Therefore, it is important that the school, the community, and the State carry out their tasks in a conscious, synergetic, integrated way that is committed with the education of future and present generations.

Thus, among today’s urban agendas, Habitat III emerges as a shared vision for a better and more sustainable future, in which all people have rights and equal access to the benefits and opportunities that cities can offer. This vision, even if it is followed by the slogan “New Urban Agenda”, is an old idea that, if effectively put into practice, can reveal the strength of global thinking and local action.

Habitat III is built on five main foundations for the implementation of the New Urban Agenda: national urban policy, urban law and regulation, urban planning and design, local economy and city budget, and local implementation. At least in theory, this is an agenda that “represents a paradigm shift in urban science and establishes patterns and principles for the planning, construction, development, management and improvement of urban areas” (ONU, 2017).

It is therefore understandable that other urban agendas that have a strong methodological, empirical, and theoretical overlap with the educating cities agenda, such as smart cities, sustainable cities, Habitat III etc., have been included in this discussion.

However, in addition to everything we have already mentioned, the issue of public spaces and, as we have argued, that of private social spaces also deserves attention when we talk about the educating city from the perspective of the right to the city. On this issue, we turn to the work of Carlos (2021), who promotes an important reflection on what the city is and what it represents.

Above all, Carlos (2021) argues that the city can hide much from the oblivious observer, because the form of the elements making up the landscape is only the look that what has been socially produced in time has taken on. This appearance can obscure or mask a reality that cannot be hidden. We speak of the city as a “representation of real social relations”, according to Carlos (2021, p. 24).

The representation of the real social relations is presented in a concrete way through a group of forms (buildings, parks, overpasses, residential condominiums etc.) that compose the urban spaces. As we can see, these forms can hide the essence of what the city really is through a game of looks.

However, for the attentive observer, we can understand the city as a product, at a given moment, of the social relations materialized in space. In other words, as Carlos (2021, p. 32) says, the city is “a historical product, the result of the activities of a series of generations who, through their common work, have acted on it, transformed it, humanized it, and turned it into a product that every day is further removed from the natural world”.

Finally, in relation to the governance and participation of citizens proposed in the diagram of the educating cities, the city can also be understood as “a way of appropriating the produced urban space” (Carlos, 2021, p. 27). In our understanding, this approach is related to the practice of the right to the city and to the perspective of the city as curriculum.

That is why we defend this approach, which emphasizes the study of the right to the city, understanding it as a condition for building the foundations for the construction and practice of the right to the educating city. By proceeding in this way, we recognize that experiences and social relations compete for their place in knowledge, and it is precisely for this reason that we understand that this proposal, although fundamental, may encounter resistance, since the curriculum is, as Arroyo (2013b) says, a contested territory.

If we understand this and try to bring the school into this discussion as an active and transforming agent, we understand Mosé’s proposition (2014, p. 56) when he teaches us that:

If we understand this and try to introduce it into education, especially in the school, it can be the result of broader movements that articulate the project of the school with the projects of a person, a society and a world. That’s why it’s good that in school we acquire a taste for politics, [...] living in a democratic environment, that we learn to be intolerant of injustice and that we always practice the right to speak.

In this way, in our understanding, beyond the school and governments, citizens and communities must engage in the public arena, seeking the common good. This is work not only for intellectuals, but for all those who in a way have a social identity associated with taste, interest, and familiarity with culture, with a sense of mission or social duty, in favor of public causes (Vieira, 2015).

Following this line of thought, Principle No. 8 of the Chart of the Educating Cities leads the educating city to promote the participation of each citizen, making the processes of decision-making open to the public. Furthermore, “children, adolescents and young people will be recognized as citizens of the present day, with the right to participate in the management and improvement of community life on the same terms as adults, with the city providing the appropriate channels and tools for this” (AICE, 2020, p. 13).

In this perspective, the cooperation and synergy between public administrations, governments, universities, institutions, companies, citizens etc., must have its embryo stored at

the base of the formation process, in other words, in the education of children, extending to basic and higher education, passing through integral and lifelong learning for the individual.

## FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

This paper examined the challenges, possibilities, and needs of the contemporary school, considering the current changes in our societies and the ways in which subjects can relate to the many spaces of learning and formation, especially outside the formal space of the school. Despite the recognition of the need to use different spaces of formation, the school continues to practice its fundamental role in initial, continuing, and lifelong education. From this perspective, we have seen that there are many possibilities and opportunities to rethink and act with the intention of creating good practices in the relationships of hospitality in the school, with a humanistic vision and a culture of peace and welcome.

In relation to the need for the school to go out into the world, we perceived that resignifying the school implies searching for alternatives that include pedagogical actions and that bring the subjects closer to their local reality, to daily life and nature, looking beyond the walls of the school. For this reason, it is necessary to understand subjects in their essence, the contexts in which they are inserted, and the relations they establish with the school and the city, the conditions and opportunities that prove to be fundamental for the construction of citizenship and the exercise of the right to the city.

Thus, we have analyzed the challenges and opportunities for the emergence and development of the educating city. It became clear that a challenge, but also an opportunity for the school in this context, is to look for ways to construct the relations of learning and teaching, understanding the city as a curriculum and as a representation of real social relations. The relevance and necessity of the school to act in synergy with its environment and with the city in general is also clear, incorporating many spaces of formation (formal, informal and non-formal), with the intention of reflecting on teaching practice and educational and municipal management.

The analysis also shows us that proposing the city as a curriculum can make learning engaging and meaningful. This approach stimulates learning in a fluid and joyful way, training individuals who are participatory and constructors of tomorrow. Here it has become clear that the pedagogical theory of Tsunessaburo Makiguti remains very contemporary because it values perception, subjectivity, feelings, and emotions, recognizing that the potential for productive participation of subjects in the societies in which they are inserted and to which they belong is related to individual happiness.

Another aspect that we should consider at this moment is the need to view the right to the city as a condition for practicing the right to the educating city. Our research has been carried out with this understanding in mind, the analysis of which particularly affects the processes of production and transformation of the regional urban spaces and the use and occupation of public spaces and private habitable spaces, considering their enormous importance for issues that revolve around social justice, the reduction of inequalities and the fundamental right to housing.

We find this understanding to be fundamental to understand that the city is, in fact, the representation of real social relations. For this reason, we invite researchers to contribute with future studies on this subject, with a perspective that seeks to fill, at least in part, the enormous gap that exists in the context of educating cities, by studying the relationship between territory and the formation processes that contribute to the integral education of individuals, the creation of identity within a place, the sense of belonging, and citizen governance and participation.



## REFERENCES

ALVES, Alceli Ribeiro; BRANDENBURG, Elena Justen. **Cidades Educadoras: um olhar acerca da cidade que educa**. Curitiba: Intersaberes, 2018.

ALVES, Alceli Ribeiro; CASTANHEIRA, Nelson Pereira. Projetos inovadores, contextos fundamentais e lacunas de pesquisa na perspectiva das Cidades Educadoras. **Revista Intersaberes**, v. 16 n. 39, p. 987-1016, 2021. Available at: <https://www.revistasuninter.com/intersaberes/index.php/revista/article/view/2197>. Access on: July 23, 2024.

ARROYO, Miguel Gonzalez. **Ofício de mestre: imagens e autoimagens**. 15. ed. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2013a.

ARROYO, Miguel Gonzalez. **Currículo, território em disputa**. 5. ed. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2013b.

ASSOCIAÇÃO INTERNACIONAL DE CIDADES EDUCADORAS (AICE). **Carta das Cidades Educadoras**. S.l.: AICE, 2020. Available at: [https://www.edcities.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/PT\\_Carta.pdf](https://www.edcities.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/11/PT_Carta.pdf). Accessed on: Feb. 18, 2022.

AZEVEDO, Joaquim. **Liberdade e política pública de educação: ensaio sobre um novo compromisso social pela educação**. Vila Nova de Gaia: Fundação Manuel Leão, 2011.

BACILA, Maria Silvia. Cidades Educadoras: um estado da arte entre 1990 e 2020 e a relação com a educação formal. **Revista Intersaberes**, v. 16, n. 39, p. 1034-1048, 2021. Available at: <https://www.revistasuninter.com/intersaberes/index.php/revista/article/view/2207>. Access on: July 23, 2024.

BAPTISTA, Isabel. Para uma fundamentação antropológica e ética da educação, a escola como lugar de hospitalidade. **EDUCA – International Catholic Journal of Education**, n. 2, p. 203-214, 2016. Available at: <https://educa.fmleao.pt/no2-2016/para-uma-fundamentacao-antropologica-e-etica-da-educacao-a-escola-como-lugar-de-hospitalidade-2>. Access on: Feb. 18, 2022.

BELLOT, Pilar Figueras. Cidades educadoras, uma aposta de futuro. In: ASSOCIAÇÃO INTERNACIONAL DAS CIDADES EDUCADORAS (AICE). **Educação e vida urbana: 20 anos de Cidades Educadoras**. Lisboa: Gráfica Almondina (Torres Novas, Portugal), 2013. p. 17-22.

BENCOSTTA, Marcus Levy. Cândido de Abreu: projetos do primeiro urbanista da cidade de Curitiba do início do século XX. **Revista Brasileira de História**, v. 36, n. 73, p. 231-254, set.-dez. 2016. Available at: <https://www.scielo.br/j/rbh/a/38W8J36ZpgRWyJhBdSSyhXH/?format=pdf&lang=pt>. Access on: Feb. 18, 2022.

BOFF, Leonardo. **Saber cuidar: ética do humano – compaixão pela terra**. 13. ed. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2007.

BONAFÉ, Jaume Martínez. La ciudad en el *currículum* y el *currículum* en la ciudad. In: GIMENO, José (ed.). **Saberes e incertidumbres sobre el currículum**. Madri: Editora Morata, 2010.

BONAFÉ, Jaume Martínez. A cidade como currículo. [Interview to] Ana Luiza Basilio. **Portal do Aprendiz**, São Paulo, 12 nov. 2014. Available at: <https://portal.aprendiz.uol.com.br/2014/11/12/cidade-como-curriculo-pesquisador-espanhol-desafia-escola-olhar-rua>. Access on: Feb. 10, 2022.

CARBONELL, Jaume Sebarroja. **Pedagogias do século XXI: bases para inovação educativa**. 3. ed. Porto Alegre: Penso, 2016.

CARBONELL, Jaume Sebarroja. Escola e entorno. In: AZEVEDO, José Clóvis de; FREIRE, Ana Maria Araújo (org.). **Utopia e democracia na educação cidadã**. Porto Alegre: Editora da Universidade, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Sul, 2000. p. 291-309.

CARLOS, Ana Fani. A. **A cidade**. São Paulo: Contexto, 2021.

CARLOS, Ana Fani. A.; VOLOCHKO, Danilo; ALVAREZ, Isabel Aparecida Pinto. **A cidade como negócio**. São Paulo: Contexto, 2015.

CARNEIRO, Alexandre de Freitas; PEREIRA, Viviana da Silva; SCHADECK, Marise; PIACENTINI, Alexandre Leonardo Simões; PIACENTINI, Marcos Simões. Cidade Educadora e Gestão Democrática da Cidade: a percepção dos Conselheiros Gestores de Educação e dos Gestores do Município de Vilhena/RO (Brasil). **Espacios**, v. 39, n. 15, 2018. Available at: <https://www.revistaespacios.com/a18v39n15/a18v39n15p21.pdf>. Access on: Feb. 10, 2022.

CASARIN, Helen de Castro Silva; CASARIN, Samuel José. **Pesquisa científica: da teoria à prática**. Curitiba: Intersaberes, 2012.

DERRIDA, Jacques; DUFOURMANTELLE, Anne. **Da hospitalidade**: Anne Dufourmantelle convida Jacques Derrida a falar da hospitalidade. São Paulo: Escuta, 2003.

GOHN, Maria da Gloria. **Conselhos gestores e participação sociopolítica**. 4ª ed. São Paulo: Cortez, 2016.

HARVEY, David. **Justiça social e a cidade**. São Paulo: Hucitec, 1973.

HARVEY, David. **Se a cidade fosse nossa**. David Harvey fala da importância de uma cidade pensada para seu povo. Publicado no Canal Se o Estado do Rio Fosse Nosso. 2015. 2:55 min. Available at: [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PW\\_ejJOR0tM](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=PW_ejJOR0tM). Access on: July 09, 2023.

HIDALGO, Angela Maria. **Gestão e currículo**: fundamentos políticos e epistemológicos dos projetos Escola Cidadã e Cidade Educadora. São Paulo: UNESP, 2008.

HOSPITALIDADE. In: **Oxford Languages**. Available at: <https://bit.ly/3vJ4vWn>. Access on: Mar. 6, 2022.

ILLICH, Ivan. **Sociedade sem escolas**. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2018.

KÖCHE, José Carlos. **Fundamentos de metodologia científica**: teoria da ciência e iniciação à pesquisa. 34. ed. Petrópolis: Vozes, 2015.

LEFEBVRE, Henri. **O direito à cidade**. São Paulo: Centauro, 2001.

MAKIGUTI, Tsunessaburo. **Educação para uma vida criativa**: ideias e propostas de Tsunessaburo Makiguti. Rio de Janeiro: Record, 1994.

MANTOAN, Maria Teresa Eglér. O direito à igualdade e à diferença na escola: desafios da inclusão. **Direcional Educador**, v. 3, p. 16-17, 2008.

MANTOAN, Maria Teresa Eglér. **Escola hospitaleira**. [Interview to] Escolas Municipais de Ribeirão Preto. [S. l.], 25 Oct. 2021. Available at: <https://youtu.be/hwXgMqNfqEM>. Access on: Feb. 27, 2022.

MESQUITA, Delma Lúcia de. Cidadania desde a infância e educação para a democracia: da negação da fala à perspectiva de fortalecimento da voz da criança. **Revista Brasileira de Educação**, v. 27, p. e270066, 2022. Available at: <https://www.scielo.br/j/rbedu/a/NTccBBYqp94d3FmCszMhSTj/?format=pdf&lang=pt>. Access on: July 09, 2023.

MÉSZÁROS, István. **A educação para além do capital**. São Paulo: Boitempo, 2005.

MOLL, Jaqueline; LECLERC, Gesuína de Fátima Elias. Educação integral em jornada ampliada: universalidade e obrigatoriedade? **Em Aberto**, v. 25, n. 88, p. 17-49, 2012. Available at: <https://rbep.inep.gov.br/ojs3/index.php/emaberto/article/view/3084>. Access on: Feb. 27, 2022.

MOLL, Jaqueline. A cidade e os seus caminhos educativos: escola, rua e itinerários juvenis. In: ASSOCIAÇÃO INTERNACIONAL DAS CIDADES EDUCADORAS (AICE). **Educação e vida urbana: 20 anos de Cidades Educadoras**. Lisboa: Gráfica Almondina (Torres Novas, Portugal), 2013. p. 213-224.

MOLL, Jaqueline; TIMM, Jordana; BERNARDI, Lucí; KUHN, Martin. Das distopias contemporâneas às sociedades sustentáveis: possibilidades a partir de cidades educadoras. **Revista Lusófona de Educação**, v. 53, n. 53, p. 47-62, 2021. Available at: <https://revistas.ulusofona.pt/index.php/rleducacao/article/view/8073/4800>. Access on: Feb. 27, 2022.

MORAES, Salette Campos de. Propostas alternativas de construção de políticas públicas em educação: novas esperanças de solução para velhos problemas? **Educar em Revista**, v. 35, p. 165-179, 2009. Available at: <https://revistas.ufpr.br/educar/article/viewFile/13602/11122>. Access on: Feb. 27, 2022.

MOSÉ, Viviane. **A escola e os desafios contemporâneos**. 3. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Civilização Brasileira, 2015.

ODERICH, Cecília Leão; BALDI, Mariana. Transformando o território: a importância da universidade de integração latino-americana para a cultura na tríplice fronteira Brasil-Paraguai-Argentina. **Revista Brasileira de Educação**, v. 25, p. e250059, 2020. Available at: <https://www.scielo.br/j/rbedu/a/5G5q4Xst8B3yVxJHKPgt9Cc/?format=pdf&lang=pt>. Access on: Feb. 27, 2022.

ORGANIZAÇÃO DAS NAÇÕES UNIDAS (ONU). **Habitat III: nova agenda urbana**. 2017. Available at: <https://habitat3.org/the-new-urban-agenda/>. Access on: July 11, 2023.

SANTOS, Milton. O dinheiro e o território. In: SANTOS, Milton; BECKER, Bertha K.; SILVA, Carlos Alberto Franco da; GONÇALVES, Carlos Walter Porto; LIMONAD, Ester; ALMEIDA, Flávio Gomes de; LIMA,IVALDO; BINSZTOK, Jacob; DE SOUZA E SILVA, Jailson; BARBOSA, Jorge Luiz; OLIVEIRA, Márcio Piñon de; FERNANDES, Nelson Nóbrega; HAESBART, Rogério; ERTHAL, Rui; MOREIRA, Ruy; CUNHA, Sandra Baptista da; MIZBUTI, Satie. **Território, territórios: ensaios sobre o ordenamento territorial**. 3. ed. Rio de Janeiro: Lamparina, 2007. p. 13-21.

SILVA-GARBOSSA, Renata Adriana. Expansão e interiorização da Universidade Tecnológica Federal do Estado do Paraná: efeitos no desenvolvimento local. 2019. 309 f. Thesis (PhD in Geography) — Setor de Ciências da Terra, Universidade Federal do Paraná, Curitiba, 2019.

TIRIBA, Léa. **Crianças da natureza**. Ministério da Educação e do Desporto. Coordenadoria de Educação Infantil. Brasília: MEC/SEF, 2010. Available at: [http://portal.mec.gov.br/index.php?option=com\\_docman&view=download&alias=6679-criancasdanatureza&Itemid=30192](http://portal.mec.gov.br/index.php?option=com_docman&view=download&alias=6679-criancasdanatureza&Itemid=30192). Access on: Feb. 18, 2022.

TONUCCI, Francesco. **Com os olhos de criança**. Porto Alegre: Artes Médicas, 1997.

TORRES, Lorena López; ROJAS, María Ignacia Castro; VILLEGAS, Priscila del Pilar López. Educación patrimonial y formación inicial docente: aportes desde el rescate y conservación del patrimonio escolar. **Revista Brasileira de Educação**, v. 26, p. 1-21, 2021. Available at: <https://www.scielo.br/j/rbedu/a/csSmYvx9ry5mMBhBxkWcS5j/?format=pdf&lang=es>. Access on: Feb. 18, 2022.

VIEIRA, Carlos Eduardo. Intelectuais e Educação. **Pensar a Educação em Revista**, v. 1, p. 1-23, 2015.

VOSS, Rita Ribeiro. **A pedagogia da felicidade de Makiguti**. Campinas: Papyrus, 2013.

WESTHEIMER, Joel. **What kind of citizen?** Educating our children for the common good. New York: Teachers College Press, 2015.

WESTHEIMER, Joel; KAHNE, Joseph. What kind of citizen? The politics of educating for democracy. **American Educational Research Journal**, v. 41, n. 2, p. 237-269, 2004. Available at: <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.3102/00028312041002237>. Access on: Feb. 18, 2022.

**How to cite this article:** ALVES, Alceli Ribeiro; SCHMIDT; Adriane da Silva. Right to the city and hospitable school: possibilities to develop educating cities. **Revista Brasileira de Educação**, v. 29, e290097, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.1590/S1413-24782024290098>

**Conflicts of interest:** The authors declare they don't have any commercial or associative interest that represents conflict of interests in relation to the manuscript.

**Funding:** The study didn't receive funding.

**Authors' contributions:** Writing – Original Draft, Methodology, Data Curation, Conceptualization, Investigation: Schmidt, A. Writing – Review & Editing, Methodology, Formal Analysis, Data Curation, Conceptualization, Investigation: Alves, A.R.

## ABOUT THE AUTHORS

ALCELI RIBEIRO ALVES has a doctorate in geography from the Universidade Federal do Paraná (UFPR). She is a professor of the Postgraduate Program in Education and New Technologies (PPGENT) at the Centro Universitário Internacional (UNINTER).

ADRIANE DA SILVA SCHMIDT is a doctoral student in education and new technologies at the Centro Universitário Internacional (UNINTER).

Received on September 23, 2022

Revised on July 11, 2023

Approved on June 19, 2023

